



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,491	07/09/2001	Avraham Oren	01/22222	4147
7590 11/20/2003				
G.E. EHRLICH (1995) LTD. c/o ANTHONY CASTORINA SUITE 207 2001 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY ARLINGTON, VA 22202			EXAMINER SMITH, CAROLYN L	
			ART UNIT 1631	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/900,491	Applicant(s) OREN ET AL.	
	Examiner Carolyn L Smith	Art Unit 1631	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☒ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: 24 and 26.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,6-12,14-23,25 and 27.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 5 and 13.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


Continuation of 2. NOTE: First, the proposed amendment has not been properly signed by the Attorney. Second, as pointed out in the FINAL rejection, mailed 8/26/03, as well as the previous Advisory Action, mailed 10/15/03, the specification, drawings, and originally filed claims do not provide support for "statistical model" as stated in proposed claim 24 (line 9). In the FINAL rejection, amended claim 19 was rejected for this NEW MATTER issue. This NEW MATTER issue was added to proposed claim 24, even though there is a lack of written basis for it. The specification does state "to apply numerical values to the interactions and the inputs, to model the application" (p. 4, lines 1-2) and Figure 5a does list specific parameters used in certain statistical tests; however, this information does not correspond in scope with or sufficiently encompass the broad idea of "statistical model" as stated in proposed claim 24 (line 9).

In addition, the lack of written description rejection is maintained for claims 1, 12, 19, and 27 due to the presence of NEW MATTER. The 35 USC 102 rejection of claims 19-23 is maintained. The 35 USC 103 rejection of 1-4, 6-12, 14-18, and 25 is maintained.

If the amendment had been entered, the proposed claim 26 would be in allowable form.

Also, if the amendment had been entered, the lack of written description rejection, 35 USC 102 rejection, and 35 USC 103 rejection would be withdrawn as a result of the cancellation of claims 1-23, 25, and 27.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Response, filed 11/03/03, was not properly signed by the Attorney. Also, the issue of NEW MATTER regarding the phrase "statistical model" still exists on line 9 of claim 24.


ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
ATTORNEY